

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 93 04:30:07 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #238  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 19 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    238

Today's Topics:

    Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
        Foreigner getting US liscence ? (2 msgs)  
    Order pizza on your autopatch now (3 msgs)  
        Presence of control operator

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 09:26:10 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hp!extra!hp!b!  
hpwin052!hpgmqoea!dstock@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

    Because of the nature of this net, it is rather dominated by computer  
(and maybe mostly software ?) type people. RF designers (myself) and  
various hardware types seem to be in the minority. This seems to  
manifest itself whenever anyone suggests hardware, and a lively debate  
about operating systems takes off. Unfortunately this sometimes obscures  
other points.

    What will the FCC do when their old mainframe finally dies ?

Just the fruits of an excessively curious mind

David GM4ZNX

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1993 19:45:54 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!  
unccsun.uncc.edu!jmcoving@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Foreigner getting US liscence ?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <jfhCADB5M.CLK@netcom.com> jfh@netcom.com (Jack Hamilton) writes:  
>You also cannot be a representative of a foreign government. I don't know  
>why that requirement is there - a holdover from more jingoistic days?

Most representatives of foreign governments have diplomatic immunity,  
and therefore can't be fined by the FCC for breaking the rules.

--  
John Covington WN4BBJ           Internet: jmcoving@mosaic.uncc.edu  
P.O. Box 217122               MCI Mail: JCOVINGTON 342-6957  
Charlotte, NC 28221-7122   Packet Radio Mail: WN4BBJ @ N7IJI.#CLT1.NC.USA.NA  
(704) 537-7653                "Kenneth, what's the frequency?" "I dunno, ask Dan"

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 10:56:01 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Foreigner getting US liscence ?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Yes, I believe you can get a U.S. ham license. However, I would sure hope  
you could turn that license back into an equivalent class license when you  
go back home. I'd be looking into that. If so, then definitely go for it!

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1993 16:56:50 +0000  
From: news!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)  
writes:  
> \*ordering food\*. This is not a drill, it actually

> says ordering food is no longer restricted.  
>  
> So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over  
> the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)  
>  
Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal  
anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and  
abolish CW next :-)

Dave

```
*****
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25      *   You think *you* have problems?   *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk  Internet *   What do you do if you *are*      *
* g4w1w@g4w1w.ampr.org      Amprnet  *   a manically depressed robot??   *
*****
```

-----  
Date: 19 Jul 1993 10:16:41 GMT  
From: news!sun1.clark.net!andy@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

David Hough (dave@llondel.demon.co.uk) wrote:  
: In article <22ar7e\$km9@access.digex.net> bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler)  
writes:  
: > \*ordering food\*. This is not a drill, it actually  
: > says ordering food is no longer restricted.  
: >  
: > So be the first on your repeater to order a pizza over  
: > the autopatch, preferably for the next ham club meeting! :)  
: >  
: Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal  
: anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and  
: abolish CW next :-)

Knowing that it is OK to order PIZZA via autopatch, the NEXT debate will  
be whether it's also OK to order a burger and fries instead. ; > K4ADL

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 11:03:51 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!  
shandrow@ames.arpa  
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Actually, I wasn't aware of this. However, I agree with it. Well, I'm not sure it is prudent for someone to use the autopatch for ordering food, but, oh well.

Just the other day I got myself into a situation where I had to use the ap to call our local transit authority. I was unsure about it but I was overheating and all and if nothing else it is an emergency communication. Does this new ruling mean it is ok for me to do this?

Btw, I'm a blind person who uses the bus system all the time and had gotten myself into a bind and had to get sked information for the bus. I was unable to locate a telephone. 73 de nu7i

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 10:48:43 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Presence of control operator  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Awhile back I had one of my friends do logging for me in contests. This was before I got a pc and a nice logging program with it. When we had those w200 calls here in AZ, my friend Cyndi helped me out with logging at our local club station, w200gv during that week. In the afternoon I would allow her to work the station, with my id every 10 minutes. I let her continue when a Canadian, Mexican, or U.S. possession station worked us. However, if anywhere else like ja tried to work us I'd take back the mic, work that station, ask if there was anymore dx, work it, then when there were no more dx only takers I'd give the mic back to her. This requires vigilance but it works quite well. We had a good time. Unfortunately, she ran off with some other guy and still hasn't gotten her ham license but she really enjoyed operating contests at the time. So, let 'em operate, usually it'll really spark them to get a ticket.  
73

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 10:27:39 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <222qvp\$i2i@bronze.lcs.mit.edu>,  
<1993Jul15.090108.23848@anomaly.sbs.com>, <1993Jul16.205607.12344@sctc.com>  
Subject : Re: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?

Don't assume for one minute that the no coders just live on 2 meters. While a lot of them do, many do not. I'd bet that those who can afford it are already getting into things like satellite and moonbounce among other things. I'm a dx'er and would promote hf to the hilt but, unfortunately, hf is starting to become obsolete. Hf should be realized for its purpose,

an affordable, albeit unreliable, form of actual communication and a fun place to do dx'ing and contesting. For things like skeds, real time data transmission, and even emergency work the satellite and other vhf/uhf/microwave technology is more promising and we need to keep our frequencies in these regions. I think the main thing to keep in mind is that we should make sure to welcome the no coders to these new regions and not force them to "live on 2 meters."

73

-----

Date: Sun, 18 Jul 93 22:09:44 GMT  
From: olivea@apple.com!netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!  
prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul16.180050.309@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,  
<226ropINNhib@west.West.Sun.COM>, <1993Jul17.204406.1@levy.fnal.gov>us.  
Subject : Re: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

In article <1993Jul17.204406.1@levy.fnal.gov> levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:  
>In article <226ropINNhib@west.West.Sun.COM>, flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd [Phoenix SE]) writes:  
>> In article <1993Jul16.180050.309@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>  
>> bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:  
>>>--  
>>>I am by no means a Burroughs fan, but don't assume that a 486 could replace a  
>>>mainframe. Yes, the 486 will beat SOME mainframes in compute power - but  
>>>the strongpoint of most mainframes is their high data throughput and ability  
>>>to serve hundreds or thousands of users. Certainly many UNIX servers will  
>>>kick the crap out of most mainframes, but a 486 won't.  
>>  
>> Agreed. But a 486 could easily take on the single task of managing the  
>> amateur radio callsign database. It's called downsizing, distributed  
>> computing,... oh well, forget it. We're talking about the government  
>> here :-)  
>  
>Only if one (1) person is going to do the maintenance at a time. Do we know  
>how many amateur radio callsign database updates the FCC does in a day? A  
>week? Can one person handle it (or three, they'd probably have to run 'round  
>the clock to keep up)? What about inquiries? Does the maintenance stop when  
>someone else needs to look up a license? We're not talking about a network  
>here, where multi-user access is possible. The original poster proposed a  
>\*single\* PC.

Oh, goodness. The original poster suggested a single PC could be

used to administer the amateur callsign database. He said nothing about how that PC is configured, nothing about the use of a network, etc. Why don't you give him the benefit of the doubt and save the flames ;-)

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1993 19:22:00 GMT  
From: olivea@apple.com!netcomsv!netcom.com!pineapp@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <222a6uINNnv8@topaz.bds.com>, <CA7Fps.BKF@feenix.metronet.com>,  
<2355@indep1.UUCP>p  
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <2355@indep1.UUCP> clifto@indep1.UUCP (Cliff Sharp) writes:  
>In article <CA7Fps.BKF@feenix.metronet.com> marcbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant) writes:

>>

>>But seriously folks, wouldn't you like to see them re-issue old calls?

>

> Not me! As my call distinguishes me as having had my license for quite a  
>few years, it was bad enough when they started issuing 1x2s in the W9xx and

I would not mind on getting my old novice call back, WN6STW. It has brought many fond memories during early 70's. It was changed automatically from the FCC I believe 1975, before 1976 centininal celebration.

WB6STW/AG Pass the code June 27, 1993.

--

```
-----+-----
| INTERNET: pineapp@netcom.com | Daniel Curry WB6STW |
| AMPRNET : dan@wb6stw.ampr.org [44.4.20.144] | E:-) Ham Radio Operator |
| AX.25 : wb6stw@n0ary.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NA | Redwood City, CA USA |
|-----+-----
```

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 93 22:25:42 GMT  
From: olivea@apple.com!netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!

prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul16.134947.1@levy.fnal.gov>,  
<willmore.742886953@tremple.gis.iastate.edu>,  
<1993Jul17.205506.1@levy.fnal.gov>prod  
Subject : Re: Callsign reissue on FCC's steam driven computer

In article <1993Jul17.205506.1@levy.fnal.gov> levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:

>In article <willmore.742886953@tremple.gis.iastate.edu>, willmore@iastate.edu (David Willmore) writes:

>> levy@levy.fnal.gov (Mark E. Levy, ext. 8056) writes:

>>

>>>You don't have enough facts to be making recommendations.

>>

>>>While your proposal may very well handle the database, you're completely  
>>>ignoring many other aspects of why a large system might be used.

>>

>> And you're ignoring that the proposal was also limiting what the system  
>> was to handle. The original system handles much more than the amateur  
>> call allocation. To replace that part of the original system, a much  
>> smaller/faster machine would work just fine.

>>

>>>If such a database were put on a PC, only \*one\* person at a time could maintain  
>>>it. Even if a network were used, the number of simultaneous accesses is fairly  
>>>small. That computer is probably used for many other things as well, and  
>>>probably has nationwide, if not worldwide access. You can't do that with a PC.

>>

>> What? One user PC? Have you never heard of Unix? Just because it runs on  
>> a pc, that doesn't make it a DOS application.

>

>Yes, a \*one\* user PC. That's what the original poster suggested.

>

>And I've heard of Unix. I just don't think much of it.

It seems that there a number of popular database engines selling  
Unix platforms today. I guess you've already dismissed these, since  
you are an anti-Unix bigot ;-).

>>>PCs are \*NOT\* the answer to everything. In fact, they're not the answer to  
most

>>>things. There are things they're good at; I don't think the FCC callsign  
>>>database is one of them.

>>

>> You're right, there are some things that PC's aren't good at. Also, the  
>> converse is true. There are some things that PC's are better at. The original  
>> poster also said that a good workstation could be used. I'd put an Alpha AXP

>> 3000/300 up against that burroughs for this job any day.

>

>I'm very encouraged by the Alpha. But, I wouldn't say that the workstation  
>versions released so far could hold a candle to the Burroughs data-moving  
>capability. CPU-wise they probably blow the Burroughs away. Megabytes-per-  
>second; I don't think so. Now, the data-center Alphas are a different story.  
>I doubt that the callsign database is very CPU-intensive.

Hmmm... Levy launches a rabid, blood-thirsty attack on Fred because Fred  
suggested a pumped 486 PC could handle all of the callsign database needs.  
Levy shreds him, saying "How can more than one person access the database?"  
obviously ignoring all the reasonable assumptions.

Then, Levy compares a completely unknown Burroughs system to an Alpha  
AXP and thinks his answer is more valid than Fred's original assertion.

Chuckle!

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Jul 1993 16:13:25 GMT  
From: valinor.mythical.com!n5ial!jim@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2hv.xr\_p@dixie.com>, <1993Jul14.231922.5752@n5ial.mythical.com>,  
<1993Jul15.172513.22562@torreypinesca.ncr.com>  
Subject : Re: recognizing machine vs hand cw

In article <1993Jul15.172513.22562@torreypinesca.ncr.com>

kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

>In article <1993Jul14.231922.5752@n5ial.mythical.com>

>jim@n5ial.mythical.com (Jim Graham) writes:

>>

>>At those

>>speeds, it's just as fast to send whole words as it is to send lots of  
>>abbreviations. Granted, there are some that come more naturally due to past  
>>experience (e.g., QTH is ... UR RST nxx ... and a few other more common  
>>abbreviations), but for the most part, you'd see a lot of whole words.

>Obviously this is false--abbreviations are always quicker to send than  
>whole words, no matter what the speed.



Ok, ok, take me literally.... :-) Let me re-phrase that, then. At those speeds (close to 30 wpm and up), the time you save using abbreviations doesn't mean a whole lot. And once you do get up in that range, cw does become far more conversational (for me, at least) than in the lower 20s.

For example, at about the time I hit 28 wpm, I stopped writing the code I was copying, and instead, just took notes. For one thing, it's hard to write that fast (I suppose I could type it as it comes in...nahhh), and even if you can write that fast, once you're at those speeds, you probably don't need to.

>>And that was using a keyer (at the time, I had a single-paddle electronic >>keyer---not really a bug, as such, just not an iambic keyer). And most of >>the time (unless I'd had a few too many beers <grin>), my code was pretty >>clean, and could probably have come from a machine (getting back to the >>issue at hand).

>

>I find that CW is the one mode I can do reasonably well when I'm, shall >we say, speech impaired ;-). They can't tell you're slurring your words, >they just think you're not that good at sending (unless they've heard you >before, in which case you just say you're using your "backup" keyer).

Not me. Besides, the keyer I had back then was, shall we say, tempermental. More to the point, it was (sometimes) a pain in the backside. It had to be nursed along during some QSOs, and there were even times when it would just lock up (sending a non-stop series of dits). Imagine the brain damage to the person on the other end!

When I tried to operate in a ``speech impaired'' mode (I like that!), the keyer seemed to act up a lot more (or perhaps I just wasn't babying it enough).

>My speed is around 23 wpm now, and I'm really starting to enjoy the >conversational nature of the mode. I've just set up a mobile HF rig, >and I am finding mobile CW to be an interesting new challenge!

Now \*THAT\* is something I haven't gotten brave enough to try....

>Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.

Too late...already done that (and I'm not about to reverse that decision, either---I finally found a UNIX that will run on my machine). Of course, I'm still back on Linux 0.99 PL6, and don't have much RAM (4 Meg), so I tend to try to avoid running GCC and X11 at the same time. :-)

--jim

--

#include <std\_disclaimer.h>

73 DE N5IAL (/4)

-----< Running Linux 0.99 PL6 >-----

INTERNET: jim@n5ial.mythical.com | j.graham@ieee.org ICBM: 30.23N 86.32W

AMATEUR RADIO: (packet station temporarily offline) AMTOR SELCAL: NIAL

-----  
E-mail me for information about KAMterm (host mode for Kantronics TNCs).

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #238

\*\*\*\*\*